

Appl. No. 10/648,942
Atty. Docket No. CM2656M
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 21, 2006

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the features of claim 8, specifically a substrate having protruding elements capable of folding to cover an adjacent first region, and forming pockets. The pockets are suitable for collection and entrapment of soil. Claim 8 is cancelled accordingly. No new matter is added.

Applicants have also amended claim 7 to be in independent form, to include the features of claim 1, and still recite a substrate having protruding elements capable of folding to cover an adjacent protruding elements, and forming pockets. The pockets are likewise suitable for collection and entrapment of soil. No new matter is added.

Claims 1 and 7, as amended have been previously examined in their dependent form (prior claims 7 – 8). No new search is required.

The claimed arrangement provides the benefit that soil can be caught in the pockets, particularly when the user changes wiping directions, as disclosed in the instant specification (8:3 – 23).

Prior claims 7 – 8 (both depending from claim 1) were rejected under 35 USC 103 over U.S. 6,383,431 (Dobrin et al.) in view of U.S. 5,633,772 (Ikeda et al.). Ikeda is relied upon for its teaching of density. Dobrin is relied upon to teach a nonwoven web having first and second regions. For the sake of expediency, Applicants will not dispute this position.


However, neither Dobrin, nor the cited combination, teach protruding elements capable of folding over to form pockets. Dobrin generally refers to “Modification of Nonwovens” (6:28), but is silent as to a specific modification which would produce the claimed pockets formed by folding of the protruding elements. Nor is it obvious to make such a modification based upon the teaching of Dobrin.

Independent claims 1 and 7 recite features not found in Dobrin or the rejecting combination (the pockets formed by folding of the protruding elements). The claimed pockets provide the benefit of improved capture of dirt, as disclosed in the specification (8:3 – 23). Based upon the foregoing amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested

Appl. No. 10/648,942
Atty. Docket No. CM2656M
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 21, 2006

to withdraw the rejections, and to reconsider and allow all claims remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,
WONG *et al.*

By 
Larry L. Huston
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 32,994
Tel. No. (513) 627-4593

Dated: April 26, 2006
Customer No. 27752